

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on July 13, 2006 has been carefully reviewed and considered. Claims 13-17, 35 and 51-53 were previously pending, Claims 13-17, 35 and 51-53 stand rejected. The Applicants have amended Claims 35 and 52. In addition, Claim 53 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Applicants have also added new Claim 54. Applicants respectfully request the entry of the foregoing Amendments and reconsideration of the present application in light of the amendments and remarks.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph Rejection

Claims 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. It is stated in the Office Action that Claims 52 and 53 contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Applicants respectfully traverse. However, to expedite prosecution of this application, the Applicants have amended Claim 52 and have cancelled Claim 53. Support for Claim 52 is found on Page 17, Lines 26-31 of the Applicants' specification.

The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 13-17, 35, and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Bisaro et al (US 5,141,894). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 35 has been amended to recite, among other things, that the structure is bonded on a surface of the carrier by molecular adhesion to constitute a bonding interface. This is not

taught in Bisaro. In addition, Bisaro does not hint, teach or suggest using molecular adhesion to bond the thin layer of the structure to the carrier. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would have no motivation to modify Bisaro or combine Bisaro with another reference to reach the subject matter recited in Claim 35. Considering that each and every element and limitation in Claim 35 must be taught in Bisaro to establish a 102 rejection, Claim 35 is distinguishable over Bisaro and is thus in a condition for allowance.

New Claim

The Applicants have added new Claim 54 to the present application. The Applicants believe that New claims are fully supported by the specification and no new matter has been added. Allowance of new Claim 54 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion


Based on all of the above, Applicants believe all claims now pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

A three month extension fee is included with this response. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for carefully examining the present application and if a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Dated: 1/16/07

Respectfully submitted,



Suvashis Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 46,554

Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040